REMARKS

Claims 15-17, 19-24, 33 and 34 are pending in this application.

By this Amendment, claim 15 is amended to recite additional features. Claims 16 and 21-23 are amended for form. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to the claims. The claims are amended as follows.

In claim 15, "the posterior surface of the optic portion" is amended to "the posterior surface of the lens." With regard to "the stepped face" in claims 21-24, since it is clearly specified in claim 16 that "stepped face" is a part of "stepped part," this rejection should be withdrawn. In claims 21-23, "the support portions" is amended to "the support portion."

In of the above, withdrawal of the objection to the claims is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. In claim 16, "an edge part" is amended to "the edge part." Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 15-17 and 19-24, 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,468,306 to Paul in view of JP 09-276303 to Hoya. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to a rejection to claims 15-17, 19-24, and 33 (a single-piece type intraocular lens), a limitation of "there is no step on the anterior surface of the lens in the boundary between the optic portion and the support portion" is added to independent claim 15.

According to this limitation, as is obvious from the description "In the embodiment, the height of the stepped part 11a is set to be 0.1 mm. Note that if the height of the stepped part is set to be 0.05 mm or more, a constant effect can be obtained. Also, when the edge part 12a is made of a soft acrylic material which is a material forming the optic portion 1" in

paragraph [0058], an effect of "it is possible to completely prevent the lens epithelial cell from migrating to the posterior of the optic portion" as described in paragraph [0059] is more effectively achieved.

On the other hand, in Fig. 14a of Paul and Fig. 2 of Hoya, a support portion is attached to almost the center of an outer peripheral surface of an optic portion in a boundary between the optic portion and the support portion. That is, in Paul or Hoya, there is a step on the anterior surface of the lens in the boundary between the optic portion and the support portion, therefore, a height of a step of posterior surface of the lens results in being lower.

Accordingly, since the subject matter of amended claim 15 is not disclosed or rendered obvious by Paul and Hoya, even if these references are combined, they do not disclose the features of claim 15 and the effect of claim 15.

Consequently, amended claims 15-17, 19-24 and 33 should not be rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Paul and Hoya.

In addition, claim 34 (a manufacturing method) is a dependent claim of claim 17, and thus should not be rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Paul and Hoya.

In view of the above, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 15-17, 19-24, 33 and 34 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Gang Luo
Registration No. 50,559

JAO:GL/jnm

Attachments:
      Request for Continued Examination
      Petition for Extension of Time

Date: May 6, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry of this filing; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461